



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/817,090	03/26/2001	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS920010053US1	7726
65362	7590	09/15/2008		
HAMILTON & TERRILE, LLP				
IBM Austin				
P.O. BOX 203518				
AUSTIN, TX 78720				
EXAMINER				
BLACKWELL, JAMES H				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/15/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/817,090

Applicant(s)

DUTTA, RABINDRANATH

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 46-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 46-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/02)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 08/18/2008 has been entered.

Claims 1-45 have been cancelled with this amendment.

Claims 46-65 are new claims.

Claims 46, 53 and 60 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 46, 49-50, 53, 56-57, 60 and 63-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (hereinafter Brown, "Using Netscape Communicator 4, Special Edition," copyright Jan 1997, QUE, pages 115-117) in view of

Hoffman Jr. et al. (hereinafter Hoffman, U.S. Patent No. 6,122,657 filed 03/11/1997, issued 09/19/2000).

In regard to independent Claim 46, Brown discloses:

- *A method of processing a structured document in an application, where the structured document comprises one or more elements (Pgs. 115-117 → Brown describes a page setup dialog box invoked from within Netscape Navigator version 4 prior to printing a hardcopy of a web page that allows the user to affect the subsequent processing of the web page prior to and while printing the web page), the method comprising:*
 - *configuring a print option, wherein the print option comprises one or more user-configurable print parameters that indicate a user preference with respect to reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document ... (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins, as well as to allow the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4. Manipulation of these settings would act to reduce consumption of at least paper and toner/ink. For example, reducing the size of the margins would allow more content to fit on a given page as would eliminating the addition of page headers and/or footers to each page (i.e., by un-checking boxes). This would lead to a reduction in the number of pages needing to be printed and as a result use less toner/ink).*

- *receiving a print request to print a hardcopy of the structured document being displayed within a browser window* (Pgs 115-117 → Brown describes that after altering page settings with the Page Setup dialog box (Fig. 8.5), a user can then either preview the settings changes (see Fig. 8.6) and then issue a print command, or can issue the print command directly);
- *in response to receiving the print request, detecting the print option* (Pgs. 116-117; Figs. 8.6, 8.7 → Brown describes a user selecting an option to print a web page, which then brings up Window's 95's print dialog box. Hence, selection of a print option is *indicated* at least visually by the appearance of the print dialog box);
- *in response to detecting the print option, generating a modified copy of the structured document in accordance with the user-configurable print parameters ...; and printing the hardcopy of the modified structured document* (Pgs. 116-117; Fig. 8.7 → Brown indicates that if the user foregoes previewing the web page(s) to be printed (e.g., ala Fig. 8.6) and instead invokes the print command from the menu bar (or Ctrl+P) directly and clicks the okay button, the web page(s) to be printed are modified per the page setup dialog selections and/or additional settings made from within the print dialog box (e.g., indicating which pages to print), and are printed by the printer).

Brown fails to disclose:

- ...*reducing consumption of one or more physical resources during printing of the structured document by modifying the content of the structured document to remove one or more of the elements prior to printing or*
- ...*generating a modified copy of the structured document for printing...by modifying the content of the structured document to remove one or more of the elements prior to printing.*

However, Hoffman discloses the removal of structured document content elements thereby modifying the document (Col. 30, lines 23-28 → Hoffman describes a web filter that can be configured to “kill” (i.e. *remove*) ads or images (i.e. *structured document content*) larger than a pre-selected image size (tested at line 506 of listing Col. 21) prior to downloading a document, thereby conserving bandwidth (*a physical resource*).

Though Hoffman is primarily concerned with the conservation of bandwidth, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, such filtering would have also contributed to the conservation of printer *physical resources* prior to printing the web page by the recipient since there would have been less content to print, thereby saving both paper and ink/toner resources.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown and Hoffman as both inventions address web page filtering to conserve resources. Adding the

disclosure of Hoffman provides the benefit of eliminating content from a web page to reduce the expenditure of physical resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 49, Brown discloses:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to include one or more additional elements in the modified structured document to indicate that the content of the structured document has been modified to remove one or more elements in response to the print request* (Pgs. 115-117; Fig. 8.5 → Brown provides a page setup dialog box that allows the user to adjust page margins (in units of inches, i.e. decrease left margin to 0.1 inch), as well as to allow for the addition of page headers/footers to each subsequently printed page within Netscape Navigator 4.

For example, the act of reducing margin widths to fit more on a given printed page would be indicated, at least visibly on the printed hardcopy by page content being printed closer to the edges of the page.

Brown also allows the user to choose to have text and lines to be printed in black only. In the case where the output is being sent to a color printer, the occurrence of text/lines in black only would be indicative of those prior settings).

In regard to dependent Claim 50, Brown fails to disclose:

- *filtering the structured document for printing to remove an element associated with a first Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) that is not located within a domain identified by a second URI by which the structured document was retrieved prior to being displayed within the browser window.*

However, Hoffman discloses *filtering the structured document for printing to remove an element associated with a first Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) that is not located within a domain identified by a second URI by which the structured document was retrieved prior to being displayed within the browser window* (Col.

3, lines 25-38 → Hoffman describes a dynamic web filter that modifies incoming structured (web) documents according to a user configuration. Hoffman also teaches that the filter can disable tags such as tags that might link to images directed toward advertising (link contains for example a/ad/subdirectory) (see also Col. 8, lines 45-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown and Hoffman as both inventions ultimately save resources. Hoffman adds filtering out components of web documents that are not desirable to the user. The benefit would have been to save resources by condensing what is viewed to the least number of pages possible, whether the output goes to a screen or to a printer.

In regard to Claims 53 and 56-57, Claims 53 and 56-57 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 46 and 49-50, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman discloses every limitation of Claims 53 and 56-57, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 46 and 49-50.

In regard to Claims 60 and 63-64, Claims 60 and 63-64 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 46 and 49-50, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman discloses every limitation of Claims 60 and 63-64, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 46 and 49-50.

Claims 47, 51, 54, 58, 61 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Hoffman, and in further view of FinePrint (documentation from old web site, 02/29/2000, downloaded from <"http://web.archive.org/web/20000301042424/www.singletrack.com/*">").

In regard to dependent Claim 47, Brown and Hoffman fail to disclose:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove one or more elements from the structured document in response to the print request.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output after the user has issued a print command and prior to the printer receiving and printing the file and provides additional formatting, control

and data transfer options (i.e. *settings*). It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents. As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser.

Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. *remove*) bitmaps (typically a graphical object) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page.

Such omission of bitmaps amounts to the *removal of such elements* from being printed thereby saving expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown, Hoffman and FinePrint as all three provide a user with the means to alter web content to be subsequently printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

In regard to dependent Claim 51, Brown and Hoffman fail to disclose:

- *filtering the structured document for printing to delete one or more elements of a specified type.*

However, FinePrint describes a "non-printer" or "virtual" printer driver that captures printer output after the user has issued a print command and prior to the

printer receiving and printing the file and provides additional formatting, control (i.e. *filtering*) and data transfer options. It works with all printers and is treated by at least a Windows system as another printer driver selectable by a user desiring to print documents.

As such, it is also available to all applications, including, for example, a web browser. Specifically, one feature allows the user to skip (i.e. omit or *delete*) bitmaps (an *element type*) (see page 1 of 10, bullet entitled "save money!") contained in, for example, a web page.

Such deletion of bitmaps saves on expensive ink, paper, filing space, disposal costs, and printer wear and tear.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the disclosures of Brown, Hoffman and FinePrint as all three provide a user with the means to alter web content to be printed such that printer resources are conserved. Adding the disclosure of FinePrint provides the benefit of omitting certain content elements that would be more expensive to render.

In regard to Claims 54 and 58, Claims 54 and 58 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 47 and 51, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman and FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 54 and 58, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 54 and 58.

In regard to Claims 61 and 65, Claims 61 and 65 merely recite a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claims 47 and 51, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman and FinePrint discloses every limitation of Claims 61 and 65, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 47 and 51.

Claims 48, 52, 55, 59 and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown in view of Hoffman, and in further view of Bickmore et al. (hereinafter Bickmore, "Digestor: Device-independent Access to the World Wide Web," 03/24/2000, downloaded from <<http://decweb.ethz.ch/WWW6/Technical/Paper177/Paper177.html>>).

In regard to dependent Claim 48, Brown and Hoffman fail to disclose:

- *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove a user-configurable amount of text from the structured document in response to the print request.*

However, Bickmore discloses *setting a user-configurable print parameter that indicates a user preference to remove a user-configurable amount of text from the structured document in response to the print request* (Sec. 5, 3rd paragraph → describes techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page originally intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process. Bickmore's invention also uses a technique

referred to as FirstSentenceElision, which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (see Sec. 4.1.2)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown, Hoffman and Bickmore because all three inventions employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to generate a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

In regard to dependent Claim 52, Brown and Hoffman fail to disclose:

- *filtering the structured document for printing to delete text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text.*

However, Bickmore discloses *deleting text within an element that is determined to be larger than a configurable maximum amount of text* (Sec. 5, 3rd paragraph → describes techniques for reducing the amount of text displayed on a pervasive (PDA, cell phone, pager) device from a web page originally intended for a normal browser. It has an automated scenario that provides the user with a forms-based control of the re-authoring process. Bickmore's invention also uses a technique referred to as FirstSentenceElision, which replaces each block of text with its first sentence (or phrase up to some natural break point), and also makes this sentence into a hypertext link to the original text block (see Sec. 4.1.2)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Brown, Hoffman and Bickmore because all three inventions employ techniques to reduce the amount of resources needed to generate a web page. Bickmore adds a feature to reduce the amount of text displayed, and perhaps printed to enable one to conserve resources.

In regard to Claims 55 and 59, Claims 55 and 59 merely recite an apparatus for carrying out the method of Claims 48 and 52, respectively. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman and Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claims 55 and 59, as indicated in the above rejections for Claims 48 and 52.

In regard to Claim 62, Claim 62 merely recites a computer program product in a computer readable medium for carrying out the method of Claim 48. Thus, Brown in view of Hoffman and Bickmore discloses every limitation of Claim 62, as indicated in the above rejection for Claim 48.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are largely moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. It is noted however, that new claims 46-65 recite similar claim limitations and language as were previously recited in Claims 1-45. The Examiner believes that the prior references previously applied to

reject Claims 1-45 also apply in combinations to Claims 46-65 as newly rejected above and fully disclose Applicants' invention.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is (571)272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 2176

James H Blackwell

09/09/2008

/Doug Hutton/

Doug Hutton

Supervisory Primary Examiner

Technology Center 2100